SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS						
RICHARD SOMERVILLE				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.					
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff			County of Residence	of First Liste	d Defendant			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Address)  Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire			NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.						
Kimmel & Silverman,									
30 E. Butler Pike				Attorneys (If Known)					
Ambler, PA 19002									
(215) 540-8888	YCTTON		try Ci	<del>*</del>	DINCID	A DADTIEC	/m1 //m11 /		
II. BASIS OF JURISE	OICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)		(For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES	Place an "X" in C and One Box f		
☐ I U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citiz		TF DEF	Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi		PTF   4	DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizensh)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	12 🗇 2	Incorporated and F of Business In A		<b>□</b> 5	<b>5</b>
	(martine official)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI							T	· Om · ====	20
CONTRACT	BEDSONAL INTUDY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR		ORFEITURE/PENALTY		NKRUPTCY eal 28 USC 158		STATUT	
110 Insurance 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury	- 🗇 62	10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 With		☐ 400 State Re☐ 410 Antitrus		nem
130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractic  365 Personal Injury		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 U	SC 157	☐ 430 Banks a☐ 450 Comme		g
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment☐		Product Liability	/ 🗇 63	30 Liquor Laws		RTY RIGHTS	460 Deporta		
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act	Slander  330 Federal Employers'	☐ 368 Asbestos Persons Injury Product		40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs.	☐ 820 Copy ☐ 830 Pater		☐ 470 Rackete	er Influenc Organizati	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Liability	□ 66	60 Occupational	☐ 840 Trad		3 480 Consun	ner Credit	0.10
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud		Safety/Health 90 Other			☐ 490 Cable/S ☐ 810 Selective		
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending		LABOR		SECURITY	☐ 850 Securiti	es/Commo	dities/
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Personal Property Damage		10 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA ☐ 862 Blac	(139511) k Lung (923)	Exchange 875 Custom		ge
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage Product Liability		20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIW	C/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 890 Other S		ctions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	-		& Disclosure Act	□ 865 RSI	(405(g))	☐ 891 Agricul	tural Acts	
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS  441 Voting	PRISONER PETITIO  ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca		40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation		s (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 892 Econon □ 893 Environ		
☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 442 Employment	Sentence	1	1 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or D	efendant)	☐ 894 Energy	Allocation .	Act
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus:  530 General		Security Act		—Third Party SC 7609	☐ 895 Freedor Act	a of Inform	ation
245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot	hor 1746	IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application			900Appeal	of Fee Deter Equal Acces	
290 All Other Real Property	Employment	550 Civil Rights	□ 46	53 Habeas Corpus -	`		to Justic	e	
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	555 Prison Condition		Alien Detainee  55 Other Immigration			950 Constitu		f
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights			Actions					
▼1 Original □ 2 Re		Remanded from [Appellate Court		stated or 5 Trans anoth (speci	terred from	☐ 6 Multidistr	ict 🗇 7 N	Appeal to I udge from Aagistrate udgment	District n
VI CAUCE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you a	re filing (	Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes u	nless diversity):	J	augment	0
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of ca Fair Debt Colle	iusc: ction Practices A	ct						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	y D	EMAND \$		HECK YES only URY DEMAND:		complaint  No	t:
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKI	ET NUMBER			
Explanation:		•							MANUFACTURE MA
DATE 1		SIGNATURE	F ATTOI	RNEY OF RECORD	····				
221	2								

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	e used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of			
Address of Plaintiff: 251 Fern Ln. Crescent CAY, CA 95531				
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Rd. Horsham, PA 19044				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:(Use Reverse Side For Accident or Transaction:(Use Reverse Side For Accident or Transaction:(Use Reverse Side For Accident or Transaction:	dditional Space)			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation ar				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	— —			
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No No			
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	D. T. C. L.			
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:				
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	· · · ·			
	Ycs No			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su action in this court?	if pending or within one year previously terminated			
	Ycs No No			
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier near the control of the cont				
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No □			
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?			
	Ycs□ No □			
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	/			
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:			
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts			
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury			
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation			
4. 🗆 Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury			
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury			
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please			
	specify)			
7. □ Civil Rights	7. Products Liability			
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8.   Products Liability — Asbestos			
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases			
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)			
11. 7 All other Federal Question Cases 15 V.S.C. \$ 1692 (Please specify)				
ARBITRATION CERTI	FICATION			
I. CVOIGTHORKINME (Check Appropriate Cat , counsel of record do hereby certify				
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and b				
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;  Relief other than monetary damages is sought.				
2/2/12	571M			
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#			
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	•			
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	ithin one year previously terminated action in this court			
except as noted above.				
DATE: 2/2/12	51100			
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#			

CIV. 609 (6/08)

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

# **CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

Richard Somerville

v. :	
nco Financial systems, inc.	
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, courd plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regard designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and state plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.	e time of e reverse ing said serve on
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	( )
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.	( )
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2	2.

Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special		
management cases.)	(	,

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

F2b.2,2012 Date	CraigThorHmmel Attorney-at-law	Richard Somerville Attorney for
215-540-8888	877-188-2864	kimmelecreditlaw.com

Telephone

exposure to asbestos.

**FAX Number** 

(d) Asbestos - Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from

E-Mail Address

**CIVIL ACTION** 

(Civ. 660) 10/02

#### 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 RICHARD SOMERVILLE, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No.: v. 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR **JURY TRIAL** 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 RICHARD SOMERVILLE ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & 12 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. 13 ("Defendant"): 14 INTRODUCTION 15 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 16 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 17 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 18 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 19 20 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 21 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 22 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 23 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 24 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established. 25 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

2

4

5

6

8

7

9

11 12

13

1415

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Crescent City, California 95531.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. <u>See</u> 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a) and <u>Wenrich v. Cole</u>, 2000 U.S. Dist LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, Pennsylvania 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 11. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 12. Upon information and belief, the debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 13. Beginning on or before December 1, 2011, and continuing through December 29, 2011, Defendant continuously and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff on his home telephone seeking and demanding payment of an alleged debt.
- 14. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, one (1) to two (2) times a day during the relevant period, leaving him pre-recorded voicemail messages.
- 15. Upon information and belief, Defendant does not update its collection records in real time to reflect the automated calls placed to consumers, like Plaintiff, and as a result,

consumers, like Plaintiff, are subjected to multiple collection calls a day.

- 16. Upon information and belief, although Defendant is aware that its collections records are not updated in real time to reflect automated calls made to consumers, it continues to make telephone calls to consumers, like Plaintiff, having the intent that its continuous and repeated telephone calls will be harassing and annoying so that consumers, like Plaintiff, will make payment on the alleged debt.
- 17. Further, in its pre-recorded voicemail messages, Defendant's employee identified herself to Plaintiff as "Ms. Collins" and instructed Plaintiff to call "Ms. Collins" back.
- 18. In those instances when Plaintiff answered Defendant's telephone calls, no one was on the other line.
- 19. Defendant intended to harass Plaintiff when it placed automated telephone calls to him, as it caused Plaintiff to stop his daily life activities to answer a phone where no live individual would be participating in the telephone conversation.
- 20. Defendant caused Plaintiff to waste his time answering calls where no live individual from Defendant was on the phone to participate in a conversation.
- 21. Within five (5) days of its initial contact with Plaintiff, Defendant failed to send Plaintiff any written notification informing him of his rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the alleged debt.
- 22. As a result, Plaintiff was unaware of the amount of the debt, the name of the creditor, and his rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.
- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on a repetitive and continuous basis with the intent of harassing Plaintiff into paying this debt.

#### **CONSTRUCTION OF LAW**

- 24. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 25. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 26. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection

practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. <u>Clomon</u>, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 27. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
  - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff;
  - d. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt; and
  - e. Defendant violation §1692g of the FDCPA by failing to send Plaintiff written notification within five (5) days of its initial communication with him informing him of the amount of the debt, the name of the creditor, and of his rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, RICHARD SOMERVILLE, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutor y damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);

- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, RICHARD SOMERVILLE, demands a jury

trial in this case.

Date: 2 2 12

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:

CRAIG THOR KIMMEL Attorney ID No. 57100 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: <u>kimmel@creditlaw.com</u>